REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-8, 10-20, 22-32, 34-36, and 38-40 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 13, and 25 are independent claims. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 15-17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 27-29, 31, 32, and 34 have been amended, claims 9, 21, 33, and 37 have been canceled, and claims 38-40 have been added. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-37, prior to this and previous Amendments, is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims 1, 3-5, 7, 8, 10, 13, 15-17, 19, 20, 22, 25, 27-29, 31, 32, and 34 were amended, and claims 9, 21, 33, and 37 were canceled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the remaining claims. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims 1-37 as presented prior to this and previous Amendments, and additional claims, in one or more continuation and/or divisional patent applications.

Support for the amendment to the claims and for the new claims is found, for example, in Applicants' specification on page 11, line 9 through page 12, line 16, page 12, line 30 through page 13, line 31, page 14, line 29 through page 15, line 3, and page 16, lines 11-19. No new matter has been added as a result of the amendments to the claims or the new claims.

Claim Rejections – Alleged Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 13-20, 25-32, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce et al., "Monitoring Distributed Systems," May 1987, University of Calgary, ACM Transactions of Computer Systems, Vol. 5, No. 2, pp. 121-150 (hereinafter Joyce) in view of Ahmed et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,647,432 (hereinafter Ahmed). Claims 9, 21, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce in view of Ahmed and further in view of Kimura et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,173,422 (hereinafter Kimura). Claims 10-12, 22-24, and 34-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyce in view of Ahmed

and Kimura, and further in view of Darland et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,101,425 (hereinafter Darland). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Note that claims 9, 21, 33, and 37 have been canceled, and therefore the rejections to these claims are now moot.

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 13, and 25 to clarify that Applicants teach and claim sending a command to a plurality of computers on a network. Each computer system on the network has a network address and each computer system on the network is running a software management utility. As shown in independent claim 1, Applicants teach and claim:

- cross-referencing into a table each computer system on the network to the network address of the computer system and to the software management utility running on the computer system;
- entering the command on a command line in a local command interface;
- specifying in the local command interface the plurality of computer systems on the network on which the command is to be concurrently executed;
- mapping the command entered in the local command interface onto a plurality of corresponding commands, each corresponding command being a particular command of a particular software management utility running on a particular computer system of the specified computer systems;
- dispatching, using the cross-referenced network address of the specified computer systems, the corresponding commands to the specified computer systems;
- in response to the dispatching, displaying a dialog window, said dialog window being divided into sub-windows for displaying a present status of the execution of the command on each of the

specified computer systems; and

- displaying the status of the execution of the command on each of the specified computer systems within a proper sub-window.

None of the cited references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest these elements of independent claim 1. Joyce purports to teach a monitoring system that supports the observation and control of message passing within a distributed application system that consists of sets of concurrently executing processes (see Joyce, Abstract and Introduction). However, the concurrently executing processes disclosed by Joyce are not "a command" that is entered "on a command line in a local command interface," as taught and claimed by Applicants. Nor does Joyce teach or suggest "mapping the command entered in the local command interface onto a plurality of corresponding commands, each corresponding command being a particular command of a particular software management utility running on a particular computer system of the specified computer systems."

Ahmed purports to teach a method for communicating between applications using an extensible communication protocol that allows a user to visualize and control the connectivity between applications (see Ahmed, Abstract). However, Ahmed is concerned with communications between applications, not with sending a command to a plurality of computers on a network, where each computer system on the network has a network address and is running a software management utility. Ahmed does not teach or suggest many of the elements of Applicants' independent claim 1. For example, Ahmed does not teach or suggest "mapping the command entered in the local command interface onto a plurality of corresponding commands, each corresponding command being a particular command of a particular software management utility running on a particular computer system of the specified computer systems." Nor does Ahmed teach or suggest "dispatching, using the cross-referenced network address of the specified computer systems, the corresponding commands to the specified computer systems," and then "in response to the dispatching, displaying a dialog

window, said dialog window being divided into sub-windows for displaying a present status of the execution of the command on each of the specified computer systems," as taught and claimed by Applicants in independent claims 1, 13, and 25.

Neither Kimura nor Darland overcome the deficiencies of Joyce and Ahmed. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 13, and 25 are patentable over the cited references. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that independent claims 1, 13, and 25, and the claims which depend from them, be allowed.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196/
Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196
Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen
Attorneys for Applicant
Telephone: (512) 301-6738
Facsimile: (512) 301-6742